

REMARKS

Claims 27-39 and 41-44 are pending in the application, whereas claims 28-39 and 45-52 have been withdrawn. Claims 27, 40-42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as described in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. Claim 43 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as described in paragraph 4 of the Office Action. Claim 27 is the only independent claim under consideration.

On May 28, 2004, the undersigned conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner to stress that claim 27 requires the transparent adhesive layer or transparent re-peel sheet to adhesively bond on one of the "stationary electrode portion" and said liquid crystal display. On the contrary, even if PET film 4, as illustrated in Fig. 3 of Sawai et al. (Sawai) is an adhesive layer (which it is not), such a layer is nevertheless on a moveable electrode portion. During the telephone interview, the Examiner informally agreed with this distinction. As per the request of the Examiner, Applicants formally submit this Supplemental argument for consideration by the Examiner.

During the May 28th interview, the Examiner further requested that the language added to claim 27 in the April 6th Response be clarified. In accordance with the Examiner's request, the phrase "wherein the touch-input type liquid crystal display device further comprises a transparent adhesive layer or a transparent re-peel sheet adhesively bonding overall one of a stationary electrode portion-directly-formed member on which said stationary electrode portion has been directly formed and said liquid crystal display or all of said stationary electrode portion-directly-formed member, the liquid crystal display and a member disposed between the stationary electrode portion-directly-formed member and the liquid crystal display" has been changed to --wherein said touch-input type liquid crystal display device further comprises a transparent adhesive layer or a transparent re-peel sheet adhesively bonding overall one of a member on which said stationary electrode portion has been directly formed and said liquid crystal display or all of said member, said liquid crystal display and an other member disposed between said member and said liquid crystal display--. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment to the claim does not change the scope of the claim as originally presented, but clarifies the subject matter as per the Examiner's request.

In light of the above discussion and in light of the arguments submitted in the April 6th Response, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims under consideration are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuhiko TAKAHATA et al.

By: Thomas D. Robbins
Thomas D. Robbins
Registration No. 43,369
Attorney for Applicants

TDR/jlg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 22, 2004